

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 2008-447-EG – ORDER NO. 2009-_____
NOVEMBER, 2009

IN THE MATTER OF:

Petition to Establish Docket to Consider)	VERIFICATION of Joint
Implementing the Requirements of:)	Proposed Order submitted by
)	SCANA Corp. on 2009-11-03
)	
Section 1307 (State Consideration of Smart)	
Grid) of the Energy Independence and)	
Security Act of 2007.)	
)	

VERIFICATION SUMMARY of SCANA PROPOSED ORDER (PSC doc # 220123)

- This Joint Proposed Order was filed on November 3, 2009
- In this document / elaboration, SCANA failed ("F") to prove that the Stipulation suggestion to **"do nothing in Smart Grid case"** has any serious professional supporting arguments. It demonstrates lack of understanding of the idea of Smart Grid and its objectives.
- For whom is this document convenient? Surely not in the interest of the energy users, national security, and, of course SC Authorities.
- Cited from this doc # 220123), Page 3: *"3. If the Commission finds its current processes, which comport with EISA standards, should be amended or that the standards should receive further consideration, such standards should be addresses on a company-by-company basis to allow **flexibility**."* What does the emphasized word "flexibility" mean in this case? It seems that author(s) still want to have "flexibility" to mislead the Commission or to create their own convenient "Smart Grid definitions." All testimonies ignored EISA first points, also cited in the Petition, witnesses could not respond to questions from the EISA

definition (cited in the Petition) in the cross-examination, and now these basic and fundamental aspects are still ignored proving incompetence of witnesses. This is dangerous if the Commission will follow the suggestion to “do nothing.” An example of how hard it is to force utilities to acknowledge their error is seen in the PSC Docket #2009-148-E where Duke Energy Carolinas **charged one widow \$2,387.54** for their obvious organizational / programming error. What is the guarantee that they will not use similar “flexibility” in Smart Grid for their advantage against the public interest? It is very possible with the present lack of professional verification on the base of new Code or at least several strong amendments.

- SCANA failed (“F”) to correctly read and understand EISA.
- SCANA failed (“F”) to learn from the hearing (on September 22, 2009 before Commission) about any of the errors and omission in the “testimonies.” There are no words about the cross-examination; it is another omission.
- SCANA and SCE&G prove that they still do not have adequate verification ability, as it was found in PSC docket # 2008-196-E when a simple one-person verification found their “phenomenal” generator with $PF = 1.05$, their simulations of dynamics with wrong voltage, lack of knowledge about future large base load location in SC, etc. If nuclear energy renaissance opponents would use better verifications than ORS had, these errors could be used to indicate prudent necessity of serious professional verification or even maybe indicate an existence of sabotage to stop the necessary huge energy investment in SC.
- 35 pages of this Proposed Order having most material copy and pasted without EISA professional analyses are not worth the paper used for their printouts.
- SCANA failed (“F”) to disclose that utilities’ witnesses were not experts in Smart Grid and/or in Energy Security.
- Therefore, even this one document proves necessity to create serious verification stages before the Commission should review the merit and make proper and just decision. SCANA even now does not have one serious professional verifier. Note: these are my truly friendly remarks for all future parties in processes before Public Service Commission, i.e. utilities, ORS, SC industry and its residents, the USA national economic interest and security.

- By the way, two ORS Proposed Order versions I received by e-mail on November 3, 2009 have similar omissions. I have not seen them in PSC docket # 2008-447-EG.
- It does not matter how good the existing ORS Calculator is, the starting point of the due process must be Smart Grid, smart and smarter after verification not after another outage. By the way, word "Outage" is not present in the SCANA Proposed Order.

Verified by

Joseph Wojcicki – MSEE

joe4solar@aol.com

Columbia, SC

November 6, 2009

Via Electronic Mail:

The Honorable Charles Terreni
Chief Clerk / Administrator
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, SC 29210

Docket No. 2008-447-EG

Re: Petition of the Office of Regulatory Staff to Establish Docket to Consider
Implementing the Requirements of:
**Section 1307 (State Consideration of Smart Grid) of the Energy Independence and
Security Act of 2007.**

Dear Mr. TERRENI

Enclosed for filing is VERIFICATION SUMMARY of SCANA PROPOSED ORDER (PSC
doc # 220123)

I would be glad to answer any question you may have.

Very truly yours,

Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki

Cc:

brian.franklin@duke-energy.com,

ceheigel@duke-energy.com,

dex@bbrslaw.com,

wmullins@brunerpowell.com,

jimjeffries@mvalaw.com,

jane.lewis-raymond@piedmontng.com,

jfloyd@brunerpowell.com,

joe4solar@aol.com,

chad.burgess@scana.com,
keen.baker@wal-mart.com,
Len.S.Anthony@pgnmail.com,
jbowen@mcnair.net,
mkl@bbrslaw.com,
nsedwar@regstaff.sc.gov,
rdc_law@swbell.net,
robsmith@mvalaw.com,
scotttyler@mvalaw.com,
shudson@regstaff.sc.gov,
sshannon@mcnair.net,
tom.moses@momolaw.com,
tommullikin@mvalaw.com